



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

scene of the first act. Not so because Clitandre, with whose reasonable opinions those of the author himself, to be sure, are to be identified, blames the mania of the women of the time to be and appear learned, just as Chrysale does in the seventh scene of the second act, and he agrees with Jonson in that blame in general; for that is, in my opinion, quite natural considering the like subject of the pieces. But Clitandre, in agreement with Jonson, utters a thought which is not a natural consequence of that subject and that is why all this finds a place here. By saying:

"Et j'aime que souvent, aux questions qu'on fait,
Elle sache ignorer les choses qu'elle sait;
De son étude enfin je veux qu'elle se cache;
Et qu'elle ait du savoir sans vouloir qu'on le sache,"

he repeats old Morose's thought who addresses his wife that is to be, in this manner: ". . . . And do you alone so much differ from all them, that what they, with so much circumstance, affect and toil for, to seem learn'd, to seem judicious, to seem sharp and conceited, you can bury in yourself with silence . . . ?" And Clitandre's lady-love, in answering his words utterly depreciative of her own mother, gives him counsel which we hear Truewit give his friend Dauphine in *Epicœne* (iv, 1): "and fail not to make the household and servants yours, yea the whole family, and salute them by their names ('t is but light cost, if you can purchase them so) and make her physician your pensioner, and her chief woman." Molière has expressed the same thought in this manner:

"Un amant fait sa cour o'ù s'attache son cœur;
Il veut de tout le monde y gagner la faveur;
Et pour n'avoir personne à sa flamme contraire,
Jusqu'au chien du logis il s'efforce de plaire."

EUGENE LESER.

New York.

*E in TUTTI E TRE, TUTTE E TRE.**

THE latest expression on this subject is found in 'Philologische Abhandlungen Heinrich Schweizer-Sidler, zur Feier des fünfzigjährigen Jubiläums seiner Docententhätigkeit an

*The subject includes *e* in the combination of *tutti*, *tutte* with all numerals from *due* to *nove* inclusive. *Tre* is written throughout merely to prevent any possible confusion in the mind of the reader.

der Zürcher Hochschule':¹ "Tutti e tre," von Heinrich Morf. The first two pages of the article review previous opinions as to this *e*, as follows:

Salviati² thought it was equivalent to a shortened *cioè*,—omnes, id est tres (Diez, 'Gram.,' iii³, 40 note, does not accept this suggestion)—Ascoli³ makes mention of it in speaking of another word: "La voce per *ambo è amanduos*, in notevole accordo coll'it. *amendue*, e deve trattarsi di *amb-ed-due*, cfr. tutti e tre." "Auch das wird nicht befriedigen" (Morf); "Als Copula verstanden hätte es keinen Sinn" (Diez)—Blanc⁴ saw in the *e* the plural of the masculine article "welcher bei den alten häufig *e* statt *i* lautete." Its use was extended also to feminine nouns, before which it took the place of the feminine article: *tutte e tre le donne*. Morf says of this view:

"Schon Diez hat Blanc entgegengehalten, dass dann unerklärt bleibt, warum man heute nicht auch *tutti e cavalli* sagt, das selbstverständlich von den ältern Texten, welche überhaupt *e* statt *i* haben, geboten wird. Man wird es unerklärlich finden, dass die Italienische Schriftsprache diese Form des Artikels in der Verbindung von *tutti tutte* mit kardinalen bevorzugt haben, sonst aber der gewöhnlichen Form *i* treu geblieben sein und auf diese Weise einen vorher augenfälligen Parallelismus der Konstruktion zerstört haben sollte.—Was aber vollends Blanc's Auffassung unhaltbar macht ist der Umstand dass diejenigen Texte, welche als Pluralform des masc. Artikels *e* bieten, gar nicht *tutti e tre* sondern *tutti a tre* aufweisen."

Having reached a construction in which an *a* occurs, the rest of the article consists of a discussion of this construction, showing that the *a* does not represent the preposition *ad*, but that the original form was *tutta tre*, and a remnant of the Latin neuter. The writer comes near his subject again only when he says *tutta* > *tutte* by analogy to *due*. But the *e* is left altogether unnoticed. Ascoli's explanation "wird nicht befriedigen," Blanc's is "unhaltbar," but nothing else is suggested. Does *tutta tre* have any bearing on the question of *e* in *tutti e tre*? Evidently not, for

¹ "Zürich," 1891, pp. 71-79.

² 'Avvertimenti della lingua sopra il Decamerone' Milano, 1809 Lib. 4, part 4.

³ *Archivio Glottologico Italiano*, i, 204.

⁴ 'Grammatik der Italienischen Sprache.' Halle, 1844.

his first point is that the *a* is joined to *tutt* (*tutta tre* and not *tutt-a-tre*). "Die gemein-romanische Grundlage ist freilich die Nominal-konstruktion *toti tres*"; from this we derive *tutti tre*, and from *tota *tria*, *tutta tre*, but this in no way explains *e* in *tutti e tre*.

My object is, first, to give sound reasons against supposing this *e* to be another form of the masculine plural article *i*, and, secondly, to prove that it is equivalent to *et*.

Diez founded his objection to its being the article on the assertion that, as it was not used in such a construction as *tutti e cavalli* neither could it be supposed to be the article in *tutti e tre*. That such constructions were usual, the following quotations will show: 'Dodici Conti Morali,'⁵ p. 5, *tutti e frati*; p. 8, *tutti e monaci*; p. 27, *tutti e vostri peccati*; p. 33, *tutti e suoi beni*; p. 81, *tutti e suoi peccati*; p. 100, *tutti e beni*, *tutti e sollazzi*; p. 103, *tutti e folli fatti*; *e tutti e folli detti*; p. 121, *tutti e cristiani*;—'Lamenti storici'⁶ p. 227, *tutti e gran signori*;—'Hecatompila'⁷ p. 23, *tutti e suoi lacci*; 'Burcelo'⁸ *tutti e nostri paesi*.

Neither is Morf's assertion, that the texts (in which *e* is used as masculine plural article) when they come to the construction with *tutti* and a numeral employ *tutti a tre*, borne out by the facts, as the following examples will show: 'Dodici Conti Morali,' (l. c.) *tutti e tre*, and *tutte e tre*; 'Decamerone'⁹ *tutti tre*, *tutti e tre*, *tutti et tre*, *tutti & tre*; 'Zenone da Pistoja':¹⁰ *tutte tre*; 'Morgante Maggiore':¹¹ *tutti a tre*, but also *tutti tre*, *tutti et tre*; 'Burcelo,' (l. c.) *tutti tre*.

Of these texts, all of which use *e* for masculine plural article *i*, in only one (Pulci) does *tutti a tre* occur, and here we find also *tutti et tre*. Morf's assertion is, consequently, no

⁵ "Dodici Conti Morali" d'Anonimo Senese (*Scelta di Curiosità Letterarie*, ix). Bologna, 1862.

⁶ "Lamenti storici dei secoli xiv, xv, et xvi" (*Scelta*, ecc., ccxix). Bologna, 1887.

⁷ "Hecatompila" de Misser L. B. Alberto. Vineggia, 1534.

⁸ "Li Soneti del Burcelo Fiorentino." Vineggia, 1477.

⁹ "Il Decamerone" di Messer Giov. Boccaccio. Venetia, 1471.

¹⁰ "La pietosa Fonte," da Zenone da Pistoja (*Scelta*, ecc., cxxxvii) Bologna, 1874.

¹¹ "I Fatti di Carlo-magno, e de suoi Paladani." Opere dei Morgante. Date in luce per Pulci. Venetia, 1481.

argument against *e* being an equivalent of *i* in *tutti e tre*, but, rather than proving the contrary, the assertion leaves us as free to suppose it is such an equivalent in this construction as in *tutti e cavalli* and the like.

I do not believe that the *e* is another form of *i*, but am not satisfied with the objections against such a supposition given by Diez and Morf, as I have just shown. My objection is based on the three following facts:

First, in no one instance is *tutt'i tre* written. We find *tutt'i miei*, *tutt'i suoi* and *tutt'i* with nouns (as, *tutt'i cavalli*) but never with numerals (*tutt'i tre*). Now if the authors who used *e* as masculine plural article with nouns (*tutti e cavalli*) also used the regular *i* by the side of it (*tutti i cavalli*), so, if in their usage of it with numerals (*tutti e tre*) there was a consciousness that the *e* was the same as *i*, this *i* would certainly occur in some instance; its non-occurrence, then, indicates that there was no such feeling.

Secondly, in no instance does *e* occur as representing the feminine plural article *le*, but this latter form is always written in full (*tutte le donne*, not *tutte e donne*). If then it is granted that *e* is the equivalent of *i* in *tutti e tre*, what can it be in *tutte e tre*? It cannot be either masculine or feminine article. It is impossible to say it is the same as *i* or *le* and illogical to explain it in one construction (*tutti e tre*) and not in the other (*tutte e tre*). It must be the article in both or neither.

Thirdly, in the texts where we find *e* by the side of *i* as the masculine plural article, this *e* is sometimes written with the apostrophe (*e'*=*elli*) [Vid. 'Lettere Senese,'¹² p. 90: *e'suoi fatti*; 'Bindo Bonichi,'¹³ p. 170: *che e'pochi*; 'Zenone da Pistoja,' l. c., p. 55: *e'mie'chiovì*]. But it is never written this way in the combination *tutti e tre* (that is, as *tutti e'tre*). This furnishes another reason for believing that the *e* is not the same as *i* in such a combination.

What remains then? While Ascoli merely hints at the *e* being equivalent to *et*, and assigns no reasons for it, Diez and Morf offer no proof against such being the case. I have

¹² "Lettere Volgari del secolo xiii scritte da Senesi." (*Scelta*, ecc. cxvi) Bologna, 1871.

¹³ "Rime di Bindo Bonichi da Siena." (*Scelta*, ecc. lxxxii) Bologna, 1867.

shown why it cannot be the masculine plural article, but I do believe that it is *et*, though not necessarily used in the sense of German "und zwar" (which is Morf's, not Ascoli's, interpretation).

The first objection against such a supposition will naturally be that a contradiction is implied in that it is illogical to claim that *e* in *tutti e cavalli* means "the" (*i*), and in *tutti e tre*, "and" (*et*). I assert that there is no contradiction. We have

tutti i cavalli—*tutti e cavalli*
—*tutti e tre*.

We are justified in translating *e* in *tutti e cavalli* as "the" because parallel to it we have the same construction with *i* which could never be translated "and"; but in *tutti e tre* there is no such parallel from (*tutti i tre*) to guide in the rendering, and if the *e* is unsatisfactory as an article in such a connection (as I have shown it to be), there is no analogy between it and *tutti e cavalli* to deter us from seeking its explanation elsewhere.

This explanation I make as follows: One who notices the occurrences of numerals in the older texts cannot fail to mark the fact that, contrary to modern usage, the tendency was to employ the longer form; for example, *venti e nove*, *trenta e due*, *sessanta e tre*, instead of *ventinove*, etc. On account of such usage there was a feeling established that when a smaller numeral followed a greater there should be a kind of copula, or connection, between them. This usage was carried from constructions where the greater factor did not include the less (*venti e tre*) to those where it did do so (*tutti e tre*). Although there is no direct analogy, because *tutti* included the *tre* while *venti* did not, yet when a speaker, accustomed to say *venti e tre* wanted to say "all three," it is easily conceivable that, after beginning with *tutti*, he should introduce an *e* before the *tre*, just as when *venti* is followed by *tre* he had used an *e*. Nor is the want of direct analogy between *venti* and *tutti* an argument against my supposition, for the *e* was used in both cases with reference to the *tre* which followed, and not with regard to *venti* and *tutti* which preceded (and this is proved by the fact that if the speaker wanted

to say *venti uomini* he would have no idea of the introduction of an *e* between *venti* and *uomini*.)

Again, if it is objected that my supposed analogy between *venti e tre* and *tutti e tre* does not hold good, because when we find a larger numeral in connection with *tutti*, as *tutti e cinquanta*, there is no such analogy supposable; as, for instance, with a construction like *sessanta e cinquanta*, I will say that I believe the analogy began with the smaller numerals and was extended to the larger; I am justified in holding such a belief because, among the examples noted in my reading, only one such large numeral occurs, *tutti e cinquanta*;¹⁴ the others being *tutti e due*, *tre*, *quattro*, etc., up to *nove*. Besides, the instance spoken of by Salviati, Blanc, Ascoli, Diez and Morf is always *tutti e due*, or *tre*, which induces one to believe that they considered that the explanation of the phenomenon was to be discovered in a consideration of the small numeral.

Thus, I consider the *e* as a sort of "empitura," a filling-out between *tutti* and *tre*, introduced not in the sense "und zwar," nor from any particular necessity (for *tutti tre* also occurs sometimes), but merely for "leggidria," at a time when a similar *e* was in usage with the numerals. Pointing toward such a conclusion is the way the *e* is printed in the edition of Boccaccio, above referred to, where, by the side of *tutti e tre* and *tutti tre*, we find *tutti et tre* (written thus six times) *tutti & tre* (three times) *tutti & quattro*, *tutti & sette* (once each).

I explain the form *tutti a tre* similarly: the original form was doubtless *tutta tre* (Morf),¹⁵ though the author making the most extensive use of it (Cellini:¹⁶) always writes it *tutt'a tre*. I place the *tutt' a tre* (thus written) as the second stage toward *tutti a tre*. From its

¹⁴ 'Novelle di Giov. Sercambi' (*Scelta*, ecc., cxix) Bologna, 1871, p. 48.

¹⁵ On the same principle of analogy with numerals (as that spoken of above in the use of *e* between *tutti* and *tre*) may we not see in the forms *trenta*, *quaranta*, *cinquanta*, etc., up to *novanta* a parallelism in termination that induced the wide-spread usage of *tutta*, if they did not really constitute the original analogical basis for that form?

¹⁶ 'Opere,' Milano, 1806.

original connection with *tutta* as a neuter, the *a* came to be looked upon as the connecting vowel in place of *e*, and when the full *tutti* was again used, its use as a neuter ending was forgotten entirely, and it was thought of only as this connecting vowel.

L. EMIL MENDER.

Johns Hopkins University.

The Nature and Elements of Poetry. By EDMUND CLARENCE STEDMAN. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1892. 8vo, pp. xx, 338.

THIS volume, as the author tells us in his Introduction, includes the series of lectures delivered at the Johns Hopkins University, on the Percy Turnbull Memorial Foundation. The lectures have also been presented, from month to month, in the columns of *The Century Magazine*. The author points with honest pride to the fact that the Turnbull Foundation was "the first endowed lectureship of poetry in the United States; and the second throughout the universities of the English-speaking world." In the discussion before him, the author proposes to treat "of the quality and attributes of poetry itself . . . to present poetry in the concrete . . . its essence and incarnation" even at the risk, as he modestly states, of "threshing old straw." Viewing all poetry as divisible into "creation and self-expression," and wisely avoiding any detailed discussion of "schools and fashions," he deals with the "primal nature" of the poetic art. The treatise is presented in eight distinct chapters or papers as follows: Oracles Old and New; What is Poetry; Creation and Self-Expression; Melancholia; Beauty; Truth; Imagination; The Faculty Divine. Insisting, at the outset, that poetry is a force and not made by any *a priori* rules but by "nature and the foreordaining stars," he attempts, by a careful survey of the history of critical opinion, to reach "a serviceable definition" of the art. Reviewing thus the teachings of Plato, Horace, Goethe, Byron, Mill, Ruskin, Wordsworth, Emerson, Lander, Watts, and others, he gives us as his final word on the subject the following: "Poetry is rhythmical, imaginative language, expressing the invention,

taste, thought, passion and insight of the human soul." More specially and tersely, he speaks of the poet as a "revealer"; of poetry, as an "expression of the beautiful"; of feeling, as "the excitant of genuine poetry"; of poetry, as "ideal expression through words"; as either "impersonal or self-expressive"; as seen, especially, in Hebraic and Hellenic verse. In the paper on Melancholia, special stress is laid upon the "subjective undertone" of such authors as Dante and Milton; upon the romantic movement in modern English and Continental verse, and upon the "major and minor keys of lyric song" as heard in the touch of Mr. Browning and Matthew Arnold, and Swinburne "the most subjective of contemporary poets." While there is "no inevitable relation between disease and genius," the author contends for the presence of that "sublime seriousness" which is often the clearest expression of "the sadness of great souls." Some definite idea of what constitutes beauty in poetry is then sought and the critic takes occasion, once again, as in former writings, to exalt construction above mere ornamentation.

In treating of the relations of beauty and truth, timely caution is given against the tendency to make the didactic obtrusive in verse, as Wordsworth and Thompson did, while full praise is paid to that higher didacticism, the poetry of wisdom, which is so signal seen in the Book of Ecclesiastes, as, also, in Tennyson, Browning and Emerson.

Imagination as "the essential key to expression" is then discussed, and the volume closes with a clear presentation of passion, insight, genius and faith as those high and natural forms in which "The Faculty Divine" manifests itself. Such, in brief, is the drift of the discussion in hand, a discussion in which the accomplished author holds himself closely to his theme and seeks to secure and express tenable views.

Were we bent on finding ground for adverse criticism, we might modestly question the exclusive validity of the definition of poetry as given, in that, on the one hand, it is too comprehensive in its statement of separate factors and, also, not sufficiently definite in its use of the word, rhythmical. The term, metrical,